arXiv:quant-ph/0310181v1 30 Oct 2003

Anomalies of weakened decoherence criteria for quantum histories

Lajos Diósi*
Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics
H-1525 Budapest 114, POB 49, Hungary

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

The theory of decoherent histories is checked for the requirement of statistical independence of subsystems. Strikingly, this is satisfied only when the decoherence functional is diagonal in both its real *and* imaginary parts. In particular, the condition of consistency (or weak decoherence) required for the assignment of probabilities appears to be ruled out. The same conclusion is obtained independently, by claiming a plausible dynamical robustness of decoherent histories.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz,03.65.Ta,05.70.Ln

Introduction. Deriving testable statistical predictions from a given quantum state ρ is possible via decoherent histories (DH's) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5], without invoking von Neumann's concept [7] of quantum measurement and state reduction. The definitive element of DH theory is a minimum mathematical condition for the consistency of the probabilities p_α assigned to the histories α. There has been a consensus that postulating the so-called *weak* decoherence condition:

$$\mathrm{Re}D(\alpha',\alpha)=0\ ,\qquad \text{for all } \alpha\neq\alpha'\ \ ,\tag{1}$$

for the decoherence functional $D(\alpha,\alpha')$ will assure consistent probabilities. Term 'weak' means we do not require the diagonality of $\mathrm{Im}D(\alpha,\alpha')$. Yet, this Letter presents two evidences indicating that such weakened decoherence conditions are problematic. The first evidence follows from trivial combination of statistically independent subsystems. The second one follows from trivial modification of the Hamiltonian dynamics.

Histories, decoherence. To define a *history*, one introduces a sequence of binary events for a succession of instances $t_1\langle t_2\langle\dots\langle t_n$:

$$P_{\alpha_1}(t_1),P_{\alpha_2}(t_2),\dots,P_{\alpha_n}(t_n)\ \ .\tag{2}$$

For each $k=1,2,\dots,n$, the $\{P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)\}$ are various complete sets of orthogonal projectors:

$$\sum_{\alpha_k}P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)=I,\quad P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)P_{\alpha'_k}(t_k)=\delta_{\alpha_k\alpha'_k}P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)\ \ .\tag{3}$$

The history confining the events (2) will be labeled by $\alpha=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)$. All histories must be *consistent* in the sense that we can assign probabilities to them. Introducing the time-ordered class operators

$$C_\alpha=P_{\alpha_n}(t_n)\dots P_{\alpha_1}(t_1)\ \ ,\tag{4}$$

the following probability distribution is postulated:

$$p_\alpha=\langle C_\alpha^\dagger C_\alpha\rangle_\rho\ \ ,\tag{5}$$

where $<>_\rho$ stands for expectation values in state ρ. Concretely, consistency means the usual additivity of probabilities, see Refs.[2, 3, 4, 5] for standard explanation. If, in particular, we bunch two different histories α and α' into a coarse-grained one $\bar\alpha$:

$$\bar C_{\bar\alpha}=C_\alpha+C_{\alpha'}\ \ ,\tag{6}$$

then the sum rule

$$\bar p_{\bar\alpha}=p_\alpha+p_{\alpha'}\tag{7}$$

must be satisfied for $\bar p_{\bar\alpha}=\langle\bar C_{\bar\alpha}^\dagger\bar C_{\bar\alpha}\rangle_\rho$. To guarantee this, one introduces [2] the *decoherence functional*:

$$D(\alpha',\alpha)=\langle C_{\alpha'}^\dagger C_\alpha\rangle_\rho\ \ .\tag{8}$$

If $D(\alpha',\alpha)$ is diagonal in its double argument:

$$D(\alpha',\alpha)=0\ ,\qquad \text{for all } \alpha\neq\alpha'\ \ ,\tag{9}$$

the consistency (7) of the probabilities (5) is guaranteed by the absence of interference terms between the contribution of the two histories α and α'. This is why Eq.(9) is called *decoherence condition*. But it is not a necessary condition. The same interference terms cancel if we require the *weak* decoherence condition (1) instead of the stronger condition (9).

While weak decoherence was considered a kind of sufficient and necessary condition of consistency, Goldstein and Page [8] suggested a radical generalization of DH's. In their theory of *linearly positive histories* no constraint is postulated on the decoherence functional (8) and Eq.(5) does not assign probabilities. A new equation, linear in C_α, does:

$$p_\alpha=\mathrm{Re}\langle C_\alpha\rangle_\rho\ \ .\tag{10}$$

The only postulated constraint is the natural one:

$$\mathrm{Re}\langle C_\alpha\rangle_\rho\geq 0\ ,\qquad \text{for all } \alpha\tag{11}$$

simply for the sake of non-negativity of probabilities p_α (10). The consistency (7) of the probability assignment (11) is guaranteed by construction. This concept represents further loosening weak decoherence. As shown in Ref.[8], weak DH's form a subset of linearly positive histories.

Surprisingly, neither the weak decoherent nor the linear positive histories have so far been checked against common tests such as system composition or trivial dynamic perturbations. This Letter shows that these tests indicate serious inconsistencies within the concept of weak decoherent and linearly positive histories.

Test of composition. Assume two statistically independent quantum systems A and B with states ρ^A, ρ^B, respectively. Let us assume that the class operators C^A_α, C^B_β [c.f. Eq.(4)] generate consistent histories for A and B respectively. In ordinary quantum theory a trivial composition of two statistically independent subsystems is always possible. In our case the composite system's density operator is the direct product $\rho^A \otimes \rho^B$. It is plausible to expect that the operators $\{C^A_\alpha \otimes C^B_\beta\}$ will generate DH's for the composite system. This latter's decoherence functional factorizes, in obvious notations it reads:

$$D^{AB}(\alpha'\beta', \alpha\beta) = D^A(\alpha', \alpha) D^B(\beta', \beta) \quad . \tag{12}$$

It is easy to see that the weak decoherence condition (1) for the statistically independent subsystems A and B does not imply the fulfillment of the same condition for the composite system. Using weak decoherence criterium, it may thus happen that we have DH's in subsystem A and DH's in subsystem B while the composition of those DH's are, contrary to our expectations, not DH's. This anomaly follows from mere composition of the two subsystems, without any correlation or interaction between them. Exactly the same anomaly appears in the theory of linearly positive histories. The reason is that the fulfillment of the positivity condition (11) in the statistically independent subsystems can not imply its fulfillment in the composite system.

Test of dynamical stability. A given set of DH's may not persist if we alter the dynamics of the system. There are, nonetheless, situations when we expect them to persist. Rather than pursuing the general case, let us consider the simplest one. Assume we switch on a sudden external potential at $t_k + 0$ (for a single k between 1 and n) if the binary variable $P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)$ at time t_k takes value 1. It it takes 0, we do not alter the original dynamics. Let the corresponding interaction Hamiltonian be:

$$\delta H(t) = \delta(t - t_k - 0) \sum_{\alpha_k} \lambda_{\alpha_k} P_{\alpha_k}(t_k) \quad , \tag{13}$$

where the λ_{α_k} are real coupling constants. This Hamiltonian does not introduce coupling (coherence) between histories. We expect that consistency of histories is robust against it. Fortunately, an analytic treatment is possible. Under the perturbation (13), the time-ordered product (4) of Heisenberg-operators changes in the following way:

$$C_\alpha \rightarrow e^{-i\lambda_{\alpha_k}} U^\dagger(t_k) C_\alpha \quad , \tag{14}$$

where $U(t_k)$ is the unitary transformation

$$U(t_k) = \exp\left(-i \sum_{\alpha_k} \lambda_{\alpha_k}(t_k) P_{\alpha_k}(t_k) \right) \tag{15}$$

caused by the Hamiltonian (13) at time $t_k + 0$. By virtue of Eq.(14), the decoherence functional (8) changes as follows:

$$D(\alpha', \alpha) \rightarrow e^{i(\lambda_{\alpha'_k} - \lambda_{\alpha_k})} D(\alpha', \alpha) \quad . \tag{16}$$

It is now seen that the original decoherence criterium (9) is preserved whereas the weakened one (1) is not. Therefore, the DH's will loose their robustness against the trivial external fields (13) if we use the loosened (weak) decoherence condition.

The same anomaly comes about for linearly positive histories. Satisfying the positivity condition (11) for the unperturbed class operator C can not assure the positivity condition after perturbation. Under perturbation (13), the probabilities (10) would change as follows:

$$p_\alpha = \mathrm{Re}\langle C_\alpha \rangle_\rho \rightarrow \mathrm{Re} e^{-i\lambda_{\alpha_k}} \langle U^\dagger(t_k) C_\alpha \rangle_\rho \quad . \tag{17}$$

Obviously, the preservation of positivity is not guaranteed. Linearly positive histories may become lost under the influence of the trivial external field, which is contrary to our expectations.

Conclusion. We have argued that the complex decoherence functional must be diagonal. The diagonality of its real part in itself is insufficient when checked for trivial composition of statistically independent subsystems. This anomaly seems to exclude the so-called weak decoherence condition and urges to retain the stronger one. The linearly positive histories show the same anomaly in composite systems. The survival of decoherent as well as of linearly positive histories has also been tested under trivial perturbation of the Hamiltonian. Expected survival has only been obtained at the stronger decoherence condition.

The system composition evidence is likely to be an ultimate criticism. Any excuse should obviously question our standard notion of statistical independence. Once Bell-inequalities changed our standard notion of statistical 'dependence', without altering the more basic notion of statistical independence. This latter would be hard to challenge for usual closed dynamic systems where DH theory had originally been applied. The dynamical stability evidence is perhaps less convincing since the claim of stability might need further theoretical support. Finally we emphasize that *consistency* of histories had traditionally been restricted to the request of additivity of probabilities in coarse-grained histories. Consistency in composition or in perturbation had not been targeted apart from an early work [9] of the present author.

I thank Sheldon Goldstein for his contemporary remarks in 1994 on Ref.[9] as well as am I grateful to

Jonathan Halliwell for recent invaluable suggestions and for encouraging publication.

---

[*] Electronic address: diosi@rmki.kfki.hu; URL: `www.rmki.kfki.hu/~diosi`

[1] R.B. Griffiths, J. Stat. Phys. **36** 219 (1984); Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2201 (1993).

[2] M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle, in *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Science of Complexity, Vol. VIII edited by W. Zurek (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, CA, 1990); Phys. Rev. **D 47**, 3345 (1993).

[3] R. Omnès, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**, 339 (1992).

[4] H.F. Dowker and J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D 46**, 1580 (1992).

[5] J.J.Halliwell, in *Stochastic Evolution of Quantum States in Open Systems and Measurement Processes*, eds. L. Diósi and B. Lukács (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), gr-qc/9308005; Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2481 (1999).

[6] P.J. Dodd and J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 105018 (2003).

[7] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1955).

[8] S.Goldstein and D.N.Page, Phys.Rev.Lett. **74**, 3715 (1995).

[9] L. Diósi, gr-qc/9409017.